

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed September 15, 2007. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1-28 were previously pending. Claims 1, 7, 18, 21, and 28 have been amended. Claim 29 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-29 remain pending in this application.

### **Objection to Specification**

The above detailed amendment to paragraph [0013] is believed to fully overcome the outstanding objection to the specification.

### **35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) in view of Raphaeli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521).

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) and Raphaeli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521) and further in view of Krishna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6094439).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) and Raphaeli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521) and further in view of Rubino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6424629).

Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) and Raphaeli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521) and further in view of Eatherton (U.S. Patent No. 6697382).

Claims 12 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) and Raphaeli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521) and further in view of Bullman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028658).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210652) and Raphaelli et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103521) and further in view of System Packet Interface Level 4 (SPI-4) Phase 2 Revision 1: OC-192 System Interface for Physical and Link Layer Devices.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In rejecting claims 7 and 18, the Office states that:

Chiang and Raphaelli do not explicitly teach the data comprises at least one of a sequence number and a timestamp.

Eatherton in the same field of endeavor teaches control packet comprises a timestamp (column 5 lines 20-32).

Applicant agrees with the Office that the cited art, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest including a sequence number in data originating from within the first component.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 28 to in part recite that the data originating within the first component is to comprise a sequence number. Accordingly, claims 1 and 28 are in condition for allowance.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

For example, new claim 29 is distinguishable over the cited art. For example, Fig. 3 of Chiang clearly indicates that CP is to be passed from 72 to 74 and on to 75. Accordingly, this claim is allowable for this additional reason.

Also, with reference to claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that Chiang fails to teach the claimed combination of features including a “framer” contrary to Office’s assertion. In fact, undersigned was unable to even find the word in the reference. Accordingly, this claim is allowable for this additional reason.

Furthermore, claim 21 is amended to provide antecedent basis. As discussed with reference to claim 13, Chiang fails to teach the claimed framer or that a second component is intercept packets generated by the framer. Accordingly, this claim is allowable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (720-840-6740) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee herewith, to obtain a two-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from November 15, 2007, to January 15, 2008.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890**

Telephone Number: 720-840-6740

Date Jan. 15, 2008 By /Ramin Aghevli/  
Ramin Aghevli  
Reg. No. 43,462